

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/833,702	SEOK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pramila Parthasarathy	2136	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Pramila Parthasarathy.

(3) _____.

(2) Yoon Ham.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 May 2006

Time: 2:00pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1, 5, 8 and 12

Prior art documents discussed:

None


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner suggested adding the limitation "and producing a signal having an imbedding of the watermark" to Claim1. Applicant agreed and authorized the Examiner to amend the claim.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)